

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action of April 6, 2005, claims 19-25, 30, 32-34 and 36 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of non-obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent 6,651,133, claims 19-23, 25 and 30-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,050,539 to Liegner, and claims 24 and 33-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent 5,050,539 to Liegner in view of Robbins U.S. Patent 6,244,217 to Robbins.

Claims 1-18 and 37-43 were allowed. Claims 26-29 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten into independent form to include all of the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for recognizing the allowable subject matter in these claims.

In response to the Office Action, Applicant has canceled claims 26 and 32-36. Also, Applicant has amended independent claim 19 to include all of the limitations of claim 26, which directly depended from claim 19 and was indicated in the Office Action to contain allowable subject matter. Thus, claim 19 and its dependent claims 20-25 and 27-31 are now allowable for at least the reasons that claim 26 was allowable.

Applicant looks forward to receiving a notice of allowance for pending claims 1-25, 27-31 and 37-43.

**Double Patenting Rejection**

In the Office Action, claims 19-25, 30, 32-34 and 36 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of non-obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent 6,651,133 to Robbins.

Applicant has canceled claims 32-34 and 36. Also, Applicant has amended independent claim 19 to include all of the limitations of claim 26, which directly depended from claim 19 and was indicated in the Office Action to contain allowable subject matter.

Claim 26 was not subject to the double patenting rejection. Accordingly, claim 19, as now amended, and its dependent claims should no longer be subject to the double patenting

rejection. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the double patenting rejection of claims 19-25 and 30.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, claims 19-23, 25 and 30-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,050,539 to Liegner.

Applicant has canceled claim 32. Also, Applicant has amended independent claim 19 to include all of the limitations of claim 26, which directly depended from claim 19 and was indicated in the Office Action to contain allowable subject matter. Accordingly, claim 19, as now amended, and its dependent claims should no longer be subject to the anticipation rejection. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claims 19-23, 25 and 30-31.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, claims 24 and 33-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent 5,050,539 to Liegner in view of Robbins U.S. Patent 6,244,217 to Robbins.

Applicant has canceled claims 33-36. Also, Applicant has amended independent claim 19 to include all of the limitations of claim 26, which directly depended from claim 19 and was indicated in the Office Action to contain allowable subject matter. Accordingly, claim 24, which depends from amended claim 19, should no longer be subject to the obviousness rejection. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claim 24.

Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, claims 1-18 and 37-43 were allowed, and claims 26-29 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but being allowable if rewritten into independent form to include all of the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims.

Applicant has amended independent claim 19 to include all of the limitations of claim 26, which directly depended from claim 19 and was indicated in the Office Action to contain

allowable subject matter. Thus, claim 19 and its dependent claims 20-25 and 27-31 are now allowable for at least the reasons that claim 26 was allowable.

A notice of allowance for claims 1-25, 27-31 and 37-43 is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

The Applicant believes no fees or petitions are due with this filing. However, should any such fees or petitions be required, please consider this a request therefor and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 04-1415 as necessary.

This application now stands in allowable form and reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Dated: 7-6-05

Respectfully submitted,

  
S. Wade Johnson, Registration No. 50,873  
Attorney for Applicant  
USPTO Customer No. 20686

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP  
370 Seventeenth Street, Suite 4700  
Denver, Colorado 80202-5647  
Tel: 303-629-3400  
Fax: 303-629-3450